

(MR. SPEAKER)

It has been brought to my notice that a particular member of the House, if I may mention the name of my good friend, Sri N. Hutchmasthi Gowda has felt that the remark that I made namely that it is the colossal ignorance of the whip after functioning for 15 years and the whip is cracking—the last two words—would appear to have offended his susceptibilities. I was unaware of it. I did not mean anything to wound his susceptibilities. My affection for him is too deep; my affection not only for him but for every member is very great; I may tell you very honestly and sincerely, however much you might criticise me however much you might wrongly understand me, still I take a detached view and feel that your conduct is absolutely *bona fide* and if there is any cause for that deflection, it is due to me. The basic principle is, as students of trigonometry will know the more acute the angle at the base is, the more obtuse is the angle at the top because three put together must always meet. Therefore, that thing is inevitable. We are for the tenure of this legislature immutably and unalterably cast together as one unit; it is up to us to see that our duty on the Floor of this House is carried out as best as we can. Therefore, I want to say I am soory and I express regrets and the Member may take it that I have said it with all sincerity. Therefore, if there is any such instance, Hon'ble member may not hesitate to bring it to my notice. You may remember that it happened at a time when the Hon'ble Leader of the opposition was saying something and I do not want to get into details. Records are there. When it was asked whether is bound to inform me about the change in the party or the persons who have gone out of the party and all that, I said when he had made a statement to the Press should he not have taken me into confidence, and in order to co-ordinate matters, it helps everybody very much. I hope the Hon'ble Member is satisfied. I have gone to the maximum extent that lies in my power. My simple desire is that I do not want to cherish any kind of ill-feeling or rancour. In my mind I have plenty of affection for everybody individually and for all of you collectively.

Statement of the Speaker re. Position of the Leader of the Opposition and the Role of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER.—Then about the role of Opposition and what part it plays and what exactly is the position of the Leader of the Opposition, if I give you a few details of the evolution from the very beginning it will be very helpful. In the first place when the monarchy was an absolute monarchy and the theory of divine ruler prevailed, there was nothing like opposition. Later on some kind of opposition began to come into existence. The first phase of it when it came was thought that it was sedition to oppose the King or his Government. A fine distinction was drawn between the King and his Ministers. So, it got diluted to the

stage of saying they must not oppose the King but they can oppose his Ministers. It first came up that Ministers are appointed by the King, they might oppose the Ministers which is as good as opposing the King. Therefore both in theory and practice it amounted to opposing the king. This pendulum was swinging practically, for a long time.

The idea of a 'formed Opposition as the eighteenth century called it, may possibly be said to have begun in 1770, when the Rockingham whigs began consciously to oppose, if not His Majesty's Government, at least His Majesty's Ministers. For most of the eighteenth century.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಎರಡನೇ ಚಾರ್ಟರ್ ತರೆ ಕಡಿದ ರಾಗಾಯು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳು. (ನಡೆಯಲು ನಗು ;)

MR. SPEAKER.—For most of the eighteenth Century the idea of opposing the measures supported by Ministers was regarded as unconstitutional because they were, very largely the King's measures. The idea of opposing Ministers even, was regarded as unconstitutional because it involved a repudiation of the King's prerogative to choose his won servants. These constitutional theories began to weaken under George I and George II, but were still strong in the early years of George III. They disappeared quite rapidly when Charles James Fox began to lead the Opposition in 1774, but their disappearance was not entirely clear until 1830. This was mainly because the Tories, the supporters of the prerogative, were in office. It was once opined that opposition was constitutionally improper and verged upon sedition. Later on however when powers were wrested away from the monarchs converting the monarch into a constitutional head, thirst for power brought about parties. Dr. Beanchesre says in para 223 of the 3rd edition of his Parliamentary Rules and Forms that the title "His Majesty's Opposition" was first used in debate by Hobhouse, afterwards Lord Broughton, who on April 10, 1826, in a debate on the union of the office of President of the Board of Trade with that of the Treasury of the Navy, remarked that it would be hard on His Majesty's Ministers to raise objections. For his part he thought it was more hard on 'His Majesty's Opposition', to compel them to take this course. Canning hailed the phrase as a happy one, and Tirenay said that a better phrase could not have been invented to designate us, for we are certainly to all intents and purposes a branch of 'His Majesty's Government'. Sir Charles Tupper, in a farewell letter to the Canadian Conservative Party January 17, 1901 said: "The duty of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition is to exercise its vast influency in restraining vicious legislation, and in giving a loyal support to proposals of the Government which commend themselves as in the interests of the country.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಇದು ಕ್ಲೇನ್ಸ್ ಇಂಗ್ಲಿಷ್‌ಗೆ? ಯಾವುದು ಸ್ವಾಮಿ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಮಗೆ ಯಾವುದು ಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾಮಕರಣ ಮಾಡಿ. While indicating itself such measures for the common weal as are neglected by the administration. "Prior to 1841 an appeal to the people by the monarch in general election was a normal feature. After 1841 Queen Victoria was officially impartial even when, as in 1880, all her

(MR. SPEAKER)

prejudices favoured one party. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Prime Minister, who was a witness before a Select Committee on Procedure in the House of Commons said on February 16, 1931: "The House of Commons consists not only of a Government, but of an Opposition, and they have both got functions and rights." In England the function of opposition has been carried to an extreme. The leaders of the party out of power are conceived as holders of a public office as His Majesty's Loyal Opposition. Laski describes it as follows: "We have...a government in office which is, presumably, trying to do its best. Yet we pay a large number of members of the House of Commons to obstruct public business as much as they can, to take the maximum advantage of the government's mistakes, to insist that it is ruining the country, to extract from it, if possible information by which this can be proved and to flood the electorate with propaganda intended to show that the government is in fact doing the worst possible things in the worst possible way."

"In the United States this Concept of an opposition although present, has not been carried to such an extreme. Here, to a large extent, the "ins" are in complete control and the "outs" are on their own. In the U. S. in the organisation of legislative bodies, the minority commonly is allowed representation on legislative committees, roughly in the proportion that its voting strength bears to the whole membership in the body.

There are other books. Some interesting proceedings took place in the House of Commons in regard to the point that member of the House of Commons who is for the time being the leader in that House of the party in opposition to His Majesty's Government having the greatest numerical strength in that House which was the definition in the Ministers of the Crown Act, 1937, on the Leader of the Opposition. On December 9, an Hon'ble Member asked the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Neville Chamberlain) whether he would give an early date for the discussion of the Motion standing in his name, which related to certain statements made by Mr. Atlee when he was the Leader of the Opposition when he was out of England. On that question arose as to what exactly is the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition. The then Leader of the Opposition contended that he not being in the Cabinet, not being a responsible member of the Government, he could not be held responsible. The opinion was divided because, to be a Party in the executive Government or a member of the Cabinet or whether the Leader of the Opposition is part of the Government or not, should form the subject matter. I will take Hon'ble Members to some other aspects, namely, it was at the time of war when there was the Coalition Government the question during world wars whether there was really a Leader of the Opposition or not arose. The Leader of the Opposition is receiving a salary in England of 2000 and the question arose that when the parties

formed a coalition Government, should this money be paid to anybody or not. It was pointed out by Mr. Churchill that this amount should not be saved. The question was, even if it is not paid, this office still subsists. Then it was pointed out that so far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, it is such a responsible office having so many duties to discharge and that it will not be in the interest of the Government to wipe out that office altogether. It was said that a certain person was agreed to be designated as Leader of the Opposition. That is because of the supreme importance attached to that office. Now so far as duties and privileges, if we analyse, even there it will be found that it is necessary at any rate useful to have a Leader of the Opposition. It may be that there are no parties, the convention was to request a Member popular, at the same time not in the treasury benches, a Member other than that belonging to the Ruling Party to function as Leader of opposition. For the recognition of the Leader of the Opposition, I think, even on a prior occasion, I have said, the tests that have been formulated and also prevailing here are that there should be a Party which has been formed before the elections are held. That party should have approached the electorate with their ideology and they must have sought the confidence of the electorate and they must have been returned and returned in adequate numbers, the ideology must be carried on and the party must be carrying on the same ideology or any modified ideology during the period of the tenure of the legislature. These are the things that are necessary and if they are not there, then perhaps the necessary tests are not satisfied. This I mentioned to the House because a request was made to me that certain Members of this House do form themselves into a Party and therefore certain things should or should not be done. Whether I have said that or not on that occasion, these tests which have been formulated not only in this country, but in other countries, have to be applied. Having applied that, we are called to determine whether there is a party or not from out of which the Leader of the Opposition should be selected and if there is any dispute with regard to the point, if there are contending parties, who should be made the Leader of the Opposition—that power is vested in all Legislatures, so far as I am aware, with the Speaker. The Speaker himself is not given absolute discretion and cannot decide whimsically. There are conventions established. Having formulated these tests, the tests have to be applied to the entire body of people. These tests are to see that there must be some stability and continuity. That is for not any other purpose, but for the purpose of regulating, coordinating and smoothly carrying on the business of the House, that the time of the House should be utilised for the maximum benefit of transacting the business. It is in that light alone that the Leader of the Opposition is given such great prominence. He is given certain privileges and facilities. He is given a separate room and perhaps other things which are varying in various legislatures. I am not concerned with the other things that exist. I am concerned only with the principle that are to govern in recognising the Leader of the Opposition.

(MR. SPEAKER)

His first duty is to be in touch with the Leader of the House, and it is equally up to the Leader of the House to be in touch with the Leader of the Opposition. It is on these two personalities on which the Speaker relies for the purpose of co-ordinating the work of the House. The Speaker cannot and should not talk to Parties and individuals if he can possibly avoid, apart from and other than through these leaders. So, the convention is developed in England that every Thursday or Friday, at an agreed time, the Leader of the Opposition asks the Leader of the House with regard to the arrangement of the work for the succeeding week. It goes on week, to week. This is absolutely carried out there. When that statement is made, the House comes to know the nature of the work that is to be anticipated and coordinated. It is therefore necessary that these two leaders—the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition should meet as frequently as possible. It is also the convention that whenever the Leader of the House makes any policy statement, particularly with regard to the foreign affairs—which may not be our concern in this State legislature—but with regard to any important matter, if a policy statement is to be made, it is considered worth while to consult the Leader of the Opposition, acquaint him not that the Leader of the House should be guided by the Leader of the Opposition. Courtesy requires, because there has to be continuity—the reason behind all that is, if the Party in Power or the Council of Ministers loses confidence, or even a no-confidence motion is accepted by the House, the person that should step in is the Leader of the Opposition and therefore the Leader of the Opposition is normally expected to have a shadow cabinet—he is expected to have his own set ready to take over. It may be possible here or it may not be possible here. But I am concerned for the purpose of co-ordinating the work and in order to avoid expenditure of time that is taking place every day on the Floor of the House every individual Member asking the Speaker what is to be done, how it is to be done—all those things are not at all a matter to be discussed on the Floor of the House much less raised in that manner as it is done here. It is the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition that must meet often for talking these things over. Even at that stage, it does not come to me. It is through the usual channel of whips, trying to co-ordinate the work, should acquaint me with that so that I may guide the House and control the House and see that the work that is put down on the order paper is transacted smoothly without getting into any kind of unnecessary bickerings.

Now the Leader of the Opposition has got a further right namely, whenever a debate is to begin, normally—not as rigidly as a rule, the Leader of the Opposition has to be given the chance to initiate the Debate, because these policy matters will be well within his grip. Whether the policy of the Opposition fits in with the policy of the Party in Power, or not I am not analysing. I am only saying, how important the position of the Leader of the Opposition is. If it is putting supplementaries. He has a right to speak on all matters which he think

important from the point of view of the wider interests of the entire Opposition.

11-30 A.M.

If the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition gets up to put a supplementary, on account of the prestige he is held in, he is given that chance, even in preference to others. The Leader of the Opposition never asks or puts minor questions, but it is left to others. The Leader of the Opposition occupies such a high position that his statement is entitled to great respect. The Leader of the Opposition should take me into his confidence, particularly with regard to strength of the party—ideology of the party I am not concerned with because it has ups and downs—; the decrease or increase of the strength of the party are matters of supreme importance to me. I may tell the House that I have received written grievances against me that certain members who have shifted from this side to the other side have not been able to get proper seats. In fact I may bring to the notice of the House the grievance of Sri Ranganath, whom I know very well, but I could not recognise him from the present place where he is. And, when there are particularly a large number of parties, how exactly has to be done? Supposing, for any reason whatsoever, there is not a single party which can compel recognition at the hands of the Speaker? It does not mean that there should not be Leader of the Opposition. In such a case, the members of the Opposition should among themselves agree and say—this is the person most agreeable and the Speaker may consider the request and see that he is recognised as the Leader of the Opposition. The very purpose of the Opposition is co-ordination. Even when there was no Opposition, when there was the Coalition Ministry in Britain, they appointed a certain person as Leader of Opposition for facilitating work.

All these things are there. There are a very large number of books. I have got my notes, which I do not want to read. I am prepared to let the Hon'ble Members study and find out how we should co-ordinate. I am prepared to work with the members, give them all the guidance, all the literature and all the books. There is plenty of literature. The question of the Leader of the Opposition and his recognition has been the subject matter of discussion on various occasions at the Conferences of the Presiding Officers. Of course those are all private proceedings. But the gist of the proceedings is not private, I can tell them the findings and the conclusions.

With regard to the Leader of the Opposition being paid a salary or not, I have got all the detailed data here. Why not we consider it. Why not we agitate that the Leader of the Opposition should be given some remuneration? I am prepared to support to the extent that lies in my power. Let us believe in democratic functions. ಎರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಕಡೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಂಪರಿಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಒದುವುದೇ ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಮನಸ್ಸು ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಮನಸ್ಸು ಇದ್ದವರು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಒದಬಹುದು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಯಾರು ಒದುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೋ

(ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು)

ಅವರು ವೈಮನಸ್ಸಿನಿಂದ, ಬೇಜಾರಿನಿಂದ, ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಮತೆ ತೋರಿಸದೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವನ್ನು ಒಂದೇ ಇರುವವರು ಮುಂದೇನಾದರೂ ಓದಿದರೆ ಆ ಭಾವನೆ ನನಗೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಅವನ್ನು ಓದಬೇಕೆಂದವರು ಓದಲಿ. ದೇವರು ನನಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಶಕ್ತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾನೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಶಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನೂ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಕಮೈಲ್ಲರ ಸೇವೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಒದುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನನ್ನ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಅನಮಾಧಾನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. Now, I do not want to spend more time. But, I may say there is plenty of matter for study. What shall we do? Would you like to guide me further; otherwise, I have to decide the point raised by Mr. Ganji Veerappa.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ತಾವು ಈಗ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರ ಸ್ಥಾನ ಮಾನದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ರೆಕಗ್ನಿಷನ್ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಏನು ಕಂಡೀಷನ್ಸ್ ಫುರ್ನಿಷ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಸೆಳೆದಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ತಮಗೆ ವಂದನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸಮರ್ಪಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಾವು ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಳಕಳಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸಬೇಕು, ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಕಳಕಳಿಯಿಂದ ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅದೇ ಕಳಕಳಿಯನ್ನು ಆದಳತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಾದ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನಗೆ ಸಂದೇಹವಿಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗಾಂಜಿ ವಿರೇಪ್ಪನವರು ಮೊದಲೇ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಸ್ಥಾನಮಾನಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಶಂಕೆಯನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಸೆಳೆದರು. ಅದಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ವಿದ್ಯಮಾನಗಳು ನಡೆದಿವೆ. ಅವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿವೆ. ತಾವು ಏನು ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅಥವಾ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅವನ್ನು ಮೆಲಕು ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಅವನ್ನು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಇತರ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ರೂಪಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಒಂದು ಆಧಾರದ ಮೂಲಕ ತಮ್ಮ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಎತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಎರಡು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಹಾಗೂ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅನಂತರ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ರೂಪಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನಾನು ನಮ್ಮತೆಯಿಂದ ಈಗ ಸೂಚಿಸಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ದಿವಸವನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿ ನಿರ್ದೇಶನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಆ ಎರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Or, if the time of the House should not be spent on discussion or debate on the one matter, i. e., what exactly is the concept of the Leader of the Opposition, I would even suggest you may send me some notes. Then the time of the House will be saved. If the House so desires, I am prepared to allow discussion on the floor of the House. And if the House has nothing to say, I will come to some decision from the little I know.

Sri H. R. KESHAVAMURTHY.—It is left to the ruling party...

Mr. SPEAKER.—In these matters, there is nothing like a ruling party. The entire House is concerned with it. That was why I pointed out how important is the position of the Leader of the Opposition and how great it is. It is not linked to any party. It is for the purpose of co-ordinating the work. Anyhow, there will be no further discussion on this today unless members are prepared.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I want a clarification. You were pleased to say the party to which the Leader of the Opposition belongs is depleted in number, and if the other members in the Opposition were to subscribe confidence in a particular member.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not alternatively. Suppose there is no leader of any party who satisfies all the conditions, if he is not there, the office does not become vacant. The office cannot be abolished. If there are what we may call colloquially splinter groups and no single party is able to command the required minimum...

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—What is requisite number Sir ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The test that I have formulated is, when the Ruling Party resigns, then, the Leader of Opposition must be able to take over charge.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—The Leader of Opposition, with the co-operation of the other Members of other parties, may be able to form a coalition government. It need not be "by himself".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Who said "by himself ? Forgetting of the person, individuals and individualities, if there is a Cabinet which resigns for any reason, particularly in the case where a no-confidence motion is accepted, the convention is that the Leader of Opposition will be asked whether he would be able to form a stable government and not any other kind of government. In what way he gets the majority is a matter of detail. The Leader of Opposition is, normally, to be a person who should be competent to formulate government. As to how he does it, by inviting and associating other members, these are all details not to be discussed on the Floor of the House. Not only that ; the other test is that he must have enough strength to maintain the meeting of the House, that is, the minimum number that is required for the House to meet. If there is not even that strength it may not be easy. How far they should be rigidly applied, how far this House should accept it these are different matters. Then, it should be a party which has gone to the polls at the time of elections to get a symbol. These are all the tests.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, I would like to say that this is an important matter. I am not anxious that it should be discussed to-day alone. If the consensus of opinion is and if you also feel that it can be taken up on some other day, I have no objection. But, what I suggest is, it is better that we have an opportunity to discuss this important constitutional matter. So, you may fix up a day. You were pleased to mention that some of the members who have crossed over this side have not been allotted seats, I am sure that this is not linked up with the position of the opposition Leader. They may also be allotted seats.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I entirely agree. Whether there should be discussion or not, it is for the House to decide. I very much appreciate the point and as already stated, some members have written to me that places should be definitely allocated and they should be given seats. Under the rules, I am bound to do it. I do not propose to delay it indefinitely and prolong the delay. I have got already a list. They have indicated to me what exactly their position is. I request the Leader of opposition to give names of those that have ceased to

(MR. SPEAKER)

be members of his party so that I can come to a conclusion. These members have written to me saying that they have joined the Congress Party. Joining the Congress Party has two aspects; one is, that they have left this party and the other is, that they have Joined the party. Now, what follows from it? The Leader of Opposition should tell me as to who have left his party and who have joined his party.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, so far the test that has been formulated according to you, I do not think they are relevant for consideration, that is when a no-confidence motion is accepted the party in power resigns, the Leader of Opposition must be able to formulate the Government. If the party in power were to go, naturally, the Leader of Opposition must enjoy the majority confidence.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not bothered with that because I am not calling upon anybody to formulate a Government.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—That test may not be relevant in my opinion. If the Leader of Opposition were about to remove the party in power by means of a no-confidence motion, it pre-supposes that he enjoys the confidence of the majority, in which case alone he could do so.

Mr. SPEAKER.—One thing is positive, that the Council of Ministers do not carry the confidence of the majority of the Members of this House; the other is negative. Does it follow that the Leader of Opposition has the support of the majority for his being installed there?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, my point is, if the Leader of Opposition does not enjoy the confidence of the majority, he will not be able to remove the party in power. The second point is that he must have such number sufficient to form quorum in the House. I do not think only the members of opposition forming a quorum can conduct the business of the House without the government. So, the question of having a minimum number of members so as to form quorum is also not relevant.

Mr. SPEAKER.—My only answer is, read, read and study all complicated and technical matters like these. None can say that mine is the last word, without previous study.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎಂ. ದೇವ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದು ಪೀಳಿಗೆಯವರು ಮಾಡಿದಂತಹ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ಪೀಳಿಗೆಯವರು ಬಿಡಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ನೋಕಾನ್‌ಫಿಡೆನ್ಸ್ ತಂದು ಅವರನ್ನು ಡಿಫೀಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಎರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಬೇರೊಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಾವು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will cut the matter short. I will not call upon the Leader of Opposition to form a government. (laughter)

Sri V. M. DEO.—Please understand my point. My point is we may bring a non-confidence motion and defeat the Government. But,

it does not presuppose that the Leader of Opposition cannot form a Government.

The reason is this. Now we may join together to pull them down. The Government has no norms and there are no norms for people to become Ministers. The time has come for us to accept new concepts and apply them. ತತ್ತ್ವ ಪ್ರತಿಪಾದನೆಗೆ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು ಅದರೆ ಅರ್ಥವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ದೊಂಬಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರಿಗೆ ತತ್ತ್ವಗಿತ್ತ್ಯ ಒಂದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ತತ್ತ್ವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಲೇಡರ್ ಆಫ್ ದಿ ಅಪೋಸಿಷನ್ ಅವರಿಂದ ಡಿಫರೆ ಆಗಬಹುದು, ಮತ್ತು ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಪುರ್ಟಾನ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಫಾರಂ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅದರೆ ಶಾಡೋ ಕ್ಯಾಬಿನೆಟ್ ಮಾಡಕೂಡದು ಮತ್ತು ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸಾಧುವಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ಲೇಡರ್ ಆಫ್ ದಿ ಅಪೋಸಿಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೂಮು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು; ಅವರು ಅಪೋಸಿಷನ್ನಿನವರು ಇಲ್ಲಗೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಅಲ್ಲ ಸೇರಿ ಒಂದು ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ದೊಂಬಿ ಆಗಿಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಅಪೋಸಿಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಕೆಲವರು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಹೋದರು, ಅದರಿಂದ ಡಿಫರೆ ಆಯಿತು ಎಂದು. ಅವರು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋದ ತಕ್ಷಣ ಈ ವಾದ ಎತ್ತುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಲೇಡರ್ ಆಫ್ ದಿ ಹೌಸ್ ತಮಗೆ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರುಗಳಿಗೂ ಚೀಫ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರಿಗೂ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆ. ಇರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಚೀಫ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತತ್ತ್ವ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಏನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆ ಇಲ್ಲದವರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ದೇಶವನ್ನು ದೊಂಬಿಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪೂ ಮಾಡಬಲ್ಲೆ. ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗಾಂಧೀವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ಪಾಯಿಂಟನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದೇ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ, ಅದನ್ನು ತಮಗೇ ಬಿಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅವರು ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ಗುರಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದನ್ನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

DRAGGING OF AN OFFICIAL INSIDE THE L.A. HALL BY SRI S. GOPALA GOWDA.

At this stage it was seen that the Hon. Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda was approaching the Speaker through the northern passage of the Assembly Chamber, dragging a Reporter of the Legislature Secretariat.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is it that has happened? Sri S. Gopala Gowda will tell me.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಇವರು ತಮ್ಮ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟರೊ ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the member say that his speech has not been correctly reported?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು 26ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಮಾಡಿದ ಭಾಷಣ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಇದೆಯೋ, ನೋಡಿ ಬನ್ನಿ ಎಂದು ಹೊರಗೆ ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತಮಗೆ ಆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಕ್ಷಾದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಗೆ ಕರೆಯುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅಷ್ಟೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will enquire into it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋಪಾಲ ಸಾರೆನ್ (ಮೂಡಬಿದರೆ).—ಒಂದು ಕ್ಲಾಫಿಕೇಶನ್ ಬೇಕು. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂತವರು, ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಜನರಿಂದ ಬಹುಮತವನ್ನು ಗಳಿಸಿ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಮತ್ತು, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸೀಟನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಅವರ ಮತದಾರರ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಅವರ ಸೀಟು ಅಲ್ಪಸಂಖ್ಯಾತರಿಂದ ಬೇರ್ಪಟ್ಟದ್ದರಿಂದ, ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ ಆ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಏನಾದರೂ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆಯೆ? This is the problem of the electorate.